UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/422,804	10/22/1999	EDWIN SOUTHERN	00263/PP/IR	6012

7590 02/10/2006

Wenderoth, Lind & Ponack
2033 K street N.W
Washington, DC 20006

COPY

EXAMINER	
BRUSCA, JOHN S	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1631	

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/422,804	SOUTHERN, EDWIN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John S. Brusca	1631	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 November 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *17-99* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *40-95* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *17-26,38,39 and 96-99* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *27-37* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. PCT/GB89/00460.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12/8/05, 12/20/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been reassigned to a new examiner.

2. Due to new grounds of rejection not necessitated by the applicant's amendments this is a non-final rejection.

Election/Restrictions

3. Claims 40-99, filed in the amendment filed 06 December 2000 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

4. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

1. Claims 17-39 and 96-99 drawn to oligonucleotide arrays, classified in class 536, subclass 24.3.

2. Claims 40, 42, 43, multiple dependent claims 44-56, and 57, drawn to a method of making an oligonucleotide array by attachment of presynthesized oligonucleotides, classified in class 435, subclass 6

3. Claims 41, multiple dependent claims 44-56, and 58-62, drawn to a method of making an oligonucleotide array by in situ synthesis of oligonucleotides, classified in class 536, subclass 25.3

4. Claims 63-67, multiple dependent claim 70-86, 89, 90, and 95, drawn to a method of using an oligonucleotide array to assay for hybridization of an applied sample, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

5. Claims 68, 69, multiple dependent claims 70-86, and 87, drawn to a method of using an oligonucleotide array comprising all possible sequences, classified in class 435 subclass 6.

6 Claim 88, drawn to a method of using an oligonucleotide array comprising iterative hybridization with larger oligonucleotide applied samples, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

7. Claims 91-94, drawn to a method of using an oligonucleotide array to assay a nucleotide sequence of an applied sample, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

5. Inventions 1 and Inventions 2-3 are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the array of invention 1 could be made by either the method of invention 2 or 3.

6. Inventions 1 and Inventions 4-7 are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the array of invention 1 can be used in any of the methods of inventions 4-7.

7. Inventions 2-3 and Inventions 4-7 are directed to related methods. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the

inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, inventions 2-3 are drawn to methods of making oligonucleotide arrays which comprise different steps, and inventions 4-7 are drawn to methods of using oligonucleotide arrays which comprise different steps and produce different results.

8. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

9. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Groups 1-7 are not coextensive, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

10. Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention of Invention 1, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 40-95 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Information Disclosure Statement

11. Many references in the Information Disclosure Statements filed 08 December 2005 and 20 December 2005 have not been considered because the references are not publications.

Double Patenting

12. The rejection for obviousness-type double patenting over U.S. Patent No. 6,054,270 in the Office action mailed 13 July 2005 has been withdrawn in view of the terminal disclaimer filed 28 August 2001.

13. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

14. An obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but an examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined claim is either anticipated by, or would be obvious

over, the reference claim(s). see, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

15. Claims 17, 20, 25, 26, and 39 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 17-42 of copending Application No. 10/115077. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copending claims are either species of the instant claims or have only minor differences.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

16. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

17. Claims 17, 19, 21-24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stavrianopoulos et al. (reference KB in the Information Disclosure Statement filed 08 December 2005)

The claims are drawn to arrays of oligonucleotides comprising different known oligonucleotides at different positions. In some embodiments the array has a glass substrate. In some embodiments the oligonucleotides are attached to the support by a covalent linkage.

Regarding the limitations of claims 23 and 24, it is brought to the Applicant's attention that a product by process claim is examined for novelty and obviousness of the claimed product only, and that no consideration is given to the novelty or obviousness of the method of making the claimed product. See M.P.E.P. 2113.

Stravrianopoulos et al. shows in column 1, lines 29-30, and column 5 an array of oligonucleotides, with a substrate that may be plastic or glass. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 8, lines 40-45 that various (meaning different) polynucleotide samples may be present in the array.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. Claims 17, 18, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Cooke et al.

The claims are drawn to arrays of oligonucleotides comprising different known oligonucleotides at different positions. In some embodiments there are at least 72 samples in the array.

Stravrianopoulos et al. shows in column 1, lines 29-30, and column 5 an array of oligonucleotides, with a substrate that may be plastic or glass. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 8, lines 40-45 that various (meaning different) polynucleotide samples may be present in the array. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows use of conventional microtiter plates to contain the

samples in columns 12, lines 20-24. Stavrianopoulos et al. does not show the number of wells that exist in conventional microtiter plates.

Cooke et al. shows microtiter plates that differ from the conventional plates by virtue of being made from disposable plastic. Cooke et al. shows in figure 1 a microtiter plate with an 8x12 matrix of wells for a total of 96 wells.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Stavrianopoulos et al. by use of the 96 well microtiter plate of Cooke et al. for the purpose of analyzing up to 96 samples in one array.

20. Claims 17 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Suggs et al.

The claims are drawn to arrays of oligonucleotides comprising different known oligonucleotides at different positions. In some embodiments the oligonucleotides in the array are between 8 and 20 nucleotides in length.

Stravrianopoulos et al. shows in column 1, lines 29-30, and column 5 an array of oligonucleotides, with a substrate that may be plastic or glass. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 8, lines 40-45 that various (meaning different) polynucleotide samples may be present in the array. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows use of conventional microtiter plates to contain the samples in columns 12, lines 20-24. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows that the applied samples may be of small or high molecular weight in column 1, lines 29-30. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 5, lines 63-67 that oligonucleotides used to hybridize to the samples on the array should be at least 25 nucleotides in length to allow for stable hybridization with the complementary

nucleotides of the sample on the array. Stavrianopoulos et al. does not show use of samples on an array of between 8 and 20 nucleotides in length.

Suggs et al. shows in the abstract , methods section on page 6613 and Table 1 the synthesis and use of oligonucleotide probes that are 15 nucleotides in length. Suggs et al. shows in figures 1 and 2 that such probes may be used to hybridize specifically to a complementary sequence.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Stavrianopoulos et al. by use of the 15mer probes of Suggs et al. because Suggs et al. shows that oligonucleotides of that length are long enough to allow for specific hybridization and a functional equivalent to longer oligonucleotides, and further obvious because shorter oligonucleotides allow for reduced labor and cost for synthesis.

21. Claims 96, 98, and 99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Caulfield et al.

The claims are drawn to kits comprising arrays of oligonucleotides comprising different known oligonucleotides at different positions and scanners for detecting hybridization to the array.

Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 1, lines 29-30, and column 5 an array of oligonucleotides, and shows a microtiter substrate in column 12, lines 20-24. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 8, lines 40-45 that various (meaning different) polynucleotide samples may be present in the array. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows colorimetric assays of hybridization in column 6-7 and table 1. Stavrianopoulos et al. does not show computer controlled scanners of colorimetric assays.

Caulfield et al. shows in the abstract and throughout a computer controlled analysis of a microtiter assay result. Caulfield et al. shows in the methods section on page 207 that an automatic scanner/reader was used to determine the level of colored product in each well of a microtiter assay, and further shows throughout the paper a computer mediated analysis of the results of the assay.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the assay of Stavrianopoulos et al. by use of the computer mediated automatic scanning and raw data analysis of Caulfield et al. to save manual labor of analyzing the results of a colorimetric microtiter assay.

22. Claim 97 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Cooke et al. as applied to claims 17, 18, and 38 above, and further in view of Caulfield et al.

The claims are drawn to a kit comprising arrays of oligonucleotides comprising at least 72 different known oligonucleotides at different positions and scanners for detecting hybridization to the array.

Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Cooke et al. as applied to claims 17, 18, and 38 above does not show computer mediated automatic scanning and raw data analysis of a colorimetric microtiter assay.

Caulfield et al. shows in the abstract and throughout a computer controlled analysis of a microtiter assay result. Caulfield et al. shows in the methods section on page 207 that an automatic scanner/reader was used to determine the level of colored product in each well of a

microtiter assay, and further shows throughout the paper a computer mediated analysis of the results of the assay.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the assay of Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Cooke et al. as applied to claims 17, 18, and 38 above by use of the computer mediated automatic scanning and raw data analysis of Caulfield et al. to save manual labor of analyzing the results of a colorimetric microtiter assay.

23. Claims 17 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Molecular Biosystems Inc. (WO 85/01050, reference AF in the Information Disclosure Statement filed 08 December 2005).

The claims are drawn to arrays of oligonucleotides comprising different known oligonucleotides at different positions. In some embodiments the oligonucleotide is covalently linked to the support.

Sravrianopoulos et al. shows in column 1, lines 29-30, and column 5 an array of oligonucleotides, with a substrate that may be plastic or glass. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 8, lines 40-45 that various (meaning different) polynucleotide samples may be present in the array. Stavrianopoulos et al. does not show covalent linkage of oligonucleotides to supports.

Molecular Biosystems Inc. shows covalent linkages of oligonucleotides to a solid support and use of such linked oligonucleotides for hybridization assays in pages 8-9, and 34-37.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the hybridization assay of Stavrianopoulos et al. by use of the covalent linkage of Molecular Biosystems Inc. because Molecular Biosystems Inc. shows that

such covalent linkages are useful to tether hybridized polynucleotide duplexes for purification of the hybridized duplex in hybridization assays.

Response to Arguments

24. Applicant's arguments filed 14 November 2005 regarding the prior art rejections have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Those rejections of claims not reiterated in this Office action have been withdrawn. New grounds of rejection have been made over some claims. The applicants argue that Stavrianopoulos et al. uses the arrays for hybridization to probes, rather than using arrays of probes for hybridization to unknown samples. The intended use of the composition of Stavrianopoulos et al. is not relevant because Stavrianopoulos et al shows the claimed composition or makes obvious the claimed compositions in combination with other references as detailed above. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows use of known (and therefore predetermined) sequences on arrays. The applicants further argue that the samples of Stavrianopoulos et al are on different wells and are therefore on different surfaces, however a microtiter dish is a single surface comprising multiple depressions.

Allowable Subject Matter

25. Claims 27-37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

26. Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are

available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center at (800) 786-9199.Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John S. Brusca whose telephone number is 571 272-0714. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel, PhD. can be reached on 571 272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

J.S. Brusca 5 February 2006

John S. Brusca
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1631

jsb

Sheet 1 of 17

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 20, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin Southern	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
JB	62	4,689,405	8/1987	Frank et al.			
JB	86	5,348,855	9/1994	Dattagupta et al.			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO
JB	61	1 526 708	9/1978	GB				
JB	98	0 119 573 A1	9/1994	EP				

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

	1	David Kitchin QC and Richard Meade, Affymetrix' Opening Submissions, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 02517, HC 1999 04645, pages 1-81, March 22, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
	3	Bird & Bird, Notice to Admit Facts, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case no. HC 1999 04645, pages 1-5, January 28, 2000, London, United Kingdom.
	4	Richard Meade, Bristows, Second Defendant's Response to the Claimant's Notice to Admit Facts, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case no. HC 1999 04645, pages 1-3, June 22, 2000, London, United Kingdom.
	5	Bristows, Particulars of Independently Valid Claims, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case no. HC 1999 04645, pages 1-2, June 22, 2000, London, United Kingdom.

EXAMINER	DATE CONSIDERED
Jon S. Brusca	5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 20, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin Southern	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

	6	Richard Meade, Bristows, Statement of Reasons, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case no. HC 1999 04645, pages 1-4, June 30, 2000, London, United Kingdom.
	7	Bird & Bird, Statement of Opposition, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case no. HC 1999 04645, pages 1-5, June 30, 2000, London, United Kingdom.
	8	Bird & Bird, Re-Re-Re-Amended Particulars of Objections, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case no. HC 1999 04645, pages 1-5, March 13, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
	9	Alastair Wilson QC, Amended Particulars of Claim, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case no. HC 1999 02517, pages 1-11, November 26, 1999, Oxford, United Kingdom.
	10	Bird & Bird, Amended Particulars of Infringement, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case no. HC 1999 02517, pages 12-14, September 1, 2000, London, United Kingdom.
	11	Richard Meade, Defence and Counterclaim of the First and Second Defendants, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case no. HC 1999 02517, pages 1-6, August 6, 1999, London, United Kingdom.
	12	Richard Meade, Amended Particulars of Objections of the First and Second Defendants, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case no. HC 1999 02517, pages 21-37, January 15, 2001, London, United Kingdom.

EXAMINER	DATE CONSIDERED
[signature]	5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 20, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin Southern	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

	13	Manches, Re-Re-Re-Amended Reply and Defence of Counterclaim, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case no. HC 1999 02517, pp. 38-46, March 2000, Oxford, United Kingdom.
	14	Dr. David R. Bentley, Summary of Expert Report, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-38, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
	15	Dr. David R. Bentley, Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1A-1F, pages 1-124, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
	16	Dr. David R. Bentley, Annex 1 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-17, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
	17	Dr. David R. Bentley, Annex 2 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-2, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.

EXAMINER	DATE CONSIDERED
John S. Brusca	3 February 2006

*EXAMINER: *Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.*

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 20, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin Southern	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

	18	Dr. David R. Bentley, Annex 3 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-2, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
	19	Dr. David R. Bentley, Annex 4 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-4, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
no published	20	Dr. David R. Bentley, Annex 5 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-12, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
	21	Dr. David R. Bentley, Annex 6 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-8, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
	22	Dr. David R. Bentley, Annex 7 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-2, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
	23	Dr. David R. Bentley, Annex 8 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-6, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.

EXAMINER	DATE CONSIDERED
Joel S. Bruce	5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

Sheet 5 of 17

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 20, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin Southern	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

	24	Dr. David R. Bentley, Annex 9 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-12, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
	25	Dr. David R. Bentley, Annex 10 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-14, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
	26	Dr. David R. Bentley, Annex 11 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-5, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
	27	Dr. David R. Bentley, Annex 12 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-6, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
	28	Dr. David R. Bentley, Annex 13 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-8, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
	29	Dr. David R. Bentley, Annex 14 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-8, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
	30	Dr. David R. Bentley, Annex 15 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-4, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.

EXAMINER	DATE CONSIDERED
John S. Bruce	5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 20, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin Southern	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

	31	Dr. David R. Bentley, Annex 16 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-38, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
	32	Dr. David R. Bentley, Annex 17 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-4, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
	33	Dr. David R. Bentley, Annex 18 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-2, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
	34	Dr. David R. Bentley, Annex 19 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-4, January 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
NV pfleiderer	35	Prof. Wolfgang Pfleiderer, Expert Report and Annex 1, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-40 and 1-2, January 19, 2001, Konstanz, Germany.
	36	Dr. David B. Wallace, Expert Report of David Bowen Wallace, P.E., PH.D., in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-55, January 18, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
	37	Dr. David B. Wallace, Annex 1 to Expert Report of David Bowen Wallace, P.E., PH.D., in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-25, January 18, 2001, London, United Kingdom.
	38	Dr. David B. Wallace, Annex 2 to Expert Report of David Bowen Wallace, P.E., PH.D., in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-24, January 18, 2001, London, United Kingdom.

EXAMINER	DATE CONSIDERED
John S. Brusca	5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: *Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant*

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 20, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin Southern	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

	39	Dr. Paul H. Silverman, Statement of Dr. Paul Hyman Silverman and Exhibit PS-1, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-2 and 1-8, November 22, 2000, Irvine, California.
	40	Prof. Edwin M. Southern, First Witness Statement of Edwin Mellor Southern, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 , pages 1-10, May 1, 2000, Oxford, United Kingdom.
	41	Prof. Edwin M. Southern, Exhibit EMS-1 to First Witness Statement of Edwin Mellor Southern, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 , pages 1-14, May 1, 2000, Oxford, United Kingdom.
	43	Prof. Edwin M. Southern, Exhibit EMS-2 to First Witness Statement of Edwin Mellor Southern, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645, pages 1-41, May 1, 2000, Oxford, United Kingdom.
	44	Prof. Edwin M. Southern, Exhibit EMS-3 to First Witness Statement of Edwin Mellor Southern, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645, pages 1-58, May 1, 2000, Oxford, United Kingdom.
	45	Prof. Edwin M. Southern, Fifth Witness Statement of Edwin Mellor Southern, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645, pages 1-13, January 22, 2001, Oxford, United Kingdom.
	46	Prof. Edwin M. Southern, Annex 4 to Fifth Witness Statement of Edwin Mellor Southern, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645, pages 1-7, January 22, 2001, Oxford, United Kingdom.

EXAMINER John S. Brusca DATE CONSIDERED 5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

Sheet 8 of 17

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 20, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin Southern	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

MAIL TYPE DATE CANCELLED DEC 2 2005 PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

	47	Peter Jay Coassin, Witness Statement of Peter Jay Coassin, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 02517, pages 1-4, January 22, 2001, Fullerton, California.
	48	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, Witness Statement of Timothy Stephen Fell, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 02517, pages 1-11, January 18, 2001, Oxford, United Kingdom.
	49	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, Annex 1 to Witness Statement of Timothy Stephen Fell, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 02517, pages 1-5, January 18, 2001, Oxford, United Kingdom.
	50	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, Annex 2 to Witness Statement of Timothy Stephen Fell, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 02517, pages 1-6, January 18, 2001, Oxford, United Kingdom.
	51	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, Annex 3 to Witness Statement of Timothy Stephen Fell, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 02517, pages 1-8, January 18, 2001, Oxford, United Kingdom.
	52	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, Annex 4 to Witness Statement of Timothy Stephen Fell, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 02517, pages 1-11, January 18, 2001, Oxford, United Kingdom.
	53	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, Annex 5 to Witness Statement of Timothy Stephen Fell, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 02517, pages 1-2, January 18, 2001, Oxford, United Kingdom.
	54	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, Annex 6 to Witness Statement of Timothy Stephen Fell, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 02517, pages 1-11, January 18, 2001, Oxford, United Kingdom.

ND publication

EXAMINER	Jon S. Brusca	DATE CONSIDERED	5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: *Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.*

Sheet 9 of 17

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 20, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin Southern	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

no publication	55	Stewart L. Huxley, Witness Statement of Stewart Leonard Huxley, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 02517, pages 1-2, January 8, 2001, Oxford, United Kingdom.
no publication	56	Martin G. Johnson, Witness Statement of Martin George Johnson, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 02517, pages 1-7, January 19, 2001, Oxford, United Kingdom.
JSB	57	Ekins R., "Multi-analyte immunoassay", Journal of Pharmaceutical & Biomedical Analysis, Vo. 7, No. 2, pp. 155-168, 1989.
JSB	58	Kimura et al., "An Immobilized Enzyme Membrane Fabrication Method using an Ink Jet Nozzle", Biosensors, Vol. 4, pp. 41-52, 1988.
JSB	59	Geysen et al., "Strategies for epitope analysis using peptide synthesis", Journal of Immunological Methods, Vol. 102, pp. 259-274, 1987.
JSB	60	Monaco et al., "Human Genome Linking With Cosmids and Yeast Artificial Chromosomes", abstract from CSHS, p. 90, 1989.
no publication	63	Dr. Edwin Southern, Statutory Declaration of Dr. Edwin Southern, in the Opposition Proceedings against EP No. 0 619 321, pp. 1-17, Oct. 1999, Kidlington, United Kingdom.
JSB	64	Ekins R., "Why we should move towards non-isotopic immunoassay?", Presentation at International Symposium on Molecular Probes: Technology and Medical Applications, pp. 1-22, April 11-13, 1988, Florence, Italy.
JSB	65	Lysov et al., "A New Method for Determining the DNA Nucleotide Sequence by Hybridization with Oligonucleotides", Doklady Biochemistry, Vol. 303, pp. 436-438, Nov-Dec 1988.

EXAMINER	J. S. Brusca	DATE CONSIDERED	5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

Sheet 10 of 17 — INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 20, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin Southern	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

MAIL OIPE DATE DEC 20 2005 PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

CANCELLED

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

	66	Professor Edwin Southern, Witness Statement of Professor Edwin Mellor Southern, in the United Kingdom litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case no. HC 1999 02517, pp. 1-40, January 2000, Kidlington, United Kingdom.
	67	Bird and Bird, Notice of Opposition, in the Opposition Proceedings against EP No. 0 619 321 filed by Oxford Gene Technology, pp. 1-15, Oct. 1999, London, United Kingdom.
	68	Dr. Edwin Southern, Statutory Declaration of Dr. Edwin Southern, in the Opposition Proceedings against EP No. 0 619 321, pp. 1-17, Oct. 1999, Oxford, United Kingdom.
NO publication	69	Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell, Defendant's Motion for Leave to File a Second Amended Answer, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 99-348, pp. 1-16, April 2000, Wilmington, Delaware.
	70	Dale Davis, Expert Report of Dale Davis, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 99-348, pp. 1-37, August 2000, Wilmington, Delaware.
	71	Grant Morgan, Expert Report of Grant Morgan, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 99-348, pp. 1-15, August 2000, Atascadero, California.
	72	Dr. Elias Corey, Expert Report of Dr. Elias James Corey, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 99-348, pp. 1-10, August 2000, Wilmington, Delaware.
	73	Dr. James Wetmur, Expert Report of Dr. James G. Wetmur, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 99-348, pp. 1-29, August 2000, Wilmington, Delaware.
	74	Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell, Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Affymetrix's Opposition to OGT's Motion for Summary Judgment of Validity, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 99-348, pp. 1-13, September 2000, Wilmington, Delaware.

EXAMINER	DATE CONSIDERED
J. S. Brucan	5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: *Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.*

Sheet 11 of 17

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 20, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin Southern	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

	75	Dr. James Wetmur, Declaration of James G. Wetmur in Support of Affymetrix's Opposition to OGT's Motion for Summary Judgment of Validity, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 99-348, p. 1, September 2000, Palo Alto, California.
	76	Dr. James Wetmur, Expert Rebuttal Report of Dr. James G. Wetmur, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 99-348, pp. 1-45, September 2000, Palo Alto, California.
	77	Dr. Martin Adelman, Expert Report - Martin J. Adelman, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 99-348, pp. 1-16, August 2000, Washington, D.C.
NO publication	78	Dr. Elias Corey, Declaration of Dr. Elias James Corey in Support of Affymetrix' Opposition to OGT's Motion for Summary Judgment of Validity, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 99-348, p. 1, September 2000, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
NO publication	79	Pretrial Order Exhibits 1-5 and 12-13, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 99-348, pp. 1-110, October 2000, Wilmington, Delaware.
	80	Transcript of Markman Hearing, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 99-348, pp. 1-149, October 2000, Wilmington, Delaware.
JSB	81	Wada A., Abstracts of Presentations at International Workshop on Automatic and High Speed DNA Base Sequencing, pp. 2-11, July 7-9, 1987, Okayama, Japan.
JSB	82	Wallace et al., "Hybridization of synthetic oligodeoxyribonucleotides to phi and 174 DNA: the effect of single base pair mismatch", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 6, No. 11, pp. 3543-3557, 1979.
JSB	83	Uwe Maskos, "A novel method of nucleic acid sequence analysis", Maskos Thesis submitted to University of Oxford, pp. 2-161, New College, Oxford, 1991.

EXAMINER Joel S. Bruser — DATE CONSIDERED 3 February 2006

*EXAMINER: *Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.*

Sheet 12 of 17

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 20, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin Southern	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

JSB	84	Bannworth, W. et al., "A System for the Simultaneous Chemical Synthesis of Different DNA Fragments on Solid Support", DNA, Vol. 5, No. 5, pp. 413-419, 1986.
JSB	85	Lohrmann, R. et al., "New Solid Supports for DNA Synthesis", Fourth Annual Congress for Recombinant DNA Research, p. 122, 1984.
JSB	87	Goldkorn, T. et al., "A simple and efficient enzymatic method for covalent attachment of DNA to cellulose; Application for hybridization-restriction analysis and for in vitro synthesis of DNA probes", Nucleic Acids Research, Vo. 14, No. 22, pp. 9171-9191, 1986.
JSB	88	Duncan, C. et al., "Affinity Chromatography of a Sequence-specific DNA Binding Protein Using Teflon-linked Oligonucleotides", Analytical Biochemistry, Vo. 169, pp. 104-108, 1988.
JSB	89	Voss et al., "A simple and efficient method for covalently attaching oligonucleotides to a cellulose support matrix", Biochemical Society Transactions, 165th meeting, London, pp. 367-368, 1987.
JSB	90	Nicholls, P. et al., "Nucleic Acid Analysis by Sandwich Hybridization", Journal of Clinical Laboratory Analysis, Vol. 3, pp. 122-135, 1989.
JSB	91	Wallace, R. et al., "The use of synthetic oligonucleotides as hybridization probes. II. Hybridization of oligonucleotides of mixed sequence to rabbit beta-globin DNA", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 9, No. 4, pp. 879-894, 1981.
no copy provided	~~92~~	~~File wrapper of S.N. 07/593,589 now abandoned.~~ A filing date 02 October 1990, Dattagupta et al.
JSB	93	File wrapper of S.N. 07/772,625 maturing into US 5,348,855 on September 1994 to Dattagupta et al., filing date 04 October 1991

EXAMINER	John L. Bruzga	DATE CONSIDERED	3 February 2006

EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 20, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804

APPLICANT: Edwin Southern

FILING DATE	GROUP
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

JBB	94	Sproat, B. et al., "A new linkage for solid phase synthesis of oligonucleotides", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 13, No. 8, pp. 2979-2987, 1985.
JBB	95	Kremsky, J. et al., "Immobilization of DNA via oligonucleotides containing an aldehyde or carboxylic acid group at the 5' terminus", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 15, No. 7, pp. 2891-2909, 1987.
JBB	96	Wolf, S. et al., "Rapid hybridization kinetics of DNA attached to submicron latex particles", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 15, No. 7, pp. 2911-2926, 1987.
JBB	97	Atkinson, T., "A convenient procedure for the synthesis of oligodeoxyribonucleotide affinity columns for isolation of mRNA", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 16, No. 13, p. 6232, 1988.
	99	Court Transcript of Technology Tutorial, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-72, December 2003, Wilmington, Delaware.
no publisher	100	Blank Rome LLP, OGT's Technology Tutorial, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-28, December 2003, Wilmington, Delaware.
	101	Ashby & Geddes, Defendant Mergen, Ltd.'s Slide Presentation for the December 18, 2003 Tutorial, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-11, December 2003, Wilmington, Delaware.
	102	Patton Boggs LLP, Defendant Clontech Laboratories Slide Presentation for the December 18, 2003 Tutorial, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-33, December 2003, Wilmington, Delaware.
	103	Kirkland & Ellis LLP, Letter to Perkins Coie LLP enclosing OGT's Claim Terms, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-6, April 2004, Chicago, Illinois.

EXAMINER: J. B. Bruser — DATE CONSIDERED: 5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*) U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S) (*Use several sheets if necessary*) Date Submitted to PTO: December 20, 2005	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL NO. 09/422,804
	APPLICANT Edwin Southern	
	FILING DATE October 22, 1999	GROUP 1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

	104	Perkins Coie LLP, Mergen Ltd.'s Claim Terms and Proposed Construction, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-7, April 2004, Menlo Park, California.
	105	Dr. Paul Purdue, Expert Report of Paul Edward Purdue Ph.D., in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-10, May 2004, New York, NY.
	106	Dr. Paul Purdue, Expert Report of Paul Edward Purdue Ph.D., in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-13, June 2004, New York, NY.
	107	Potter Anderson & Corroon LLP, Defendant Mergen Ltd.'s Third Set of Supplemental Responses to Oxford Gene Technology Ltd's First and Second Set of Interrogatories, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-45, June 2004, Wilmington, Delaware.
	108	Blank Rome LLP, Oxford Gene Technology Ltd.'s Claim Construction Brief, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-186, July 2004, Wilmington, Delaware.
	109	Potter Anderson & Corroon LLP, Mergen Limited's Opening Claim Construction Brief, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-37, July 2004, Wilmington, Delaware.
	110	Potter Anderson & Corroon LLP, Mergen Limited's Reply in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity of Claim 1 of United States Patent NO. 6,054,270 Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 112, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-9, August 2004, Wilmington, Delaware.
	111	Potter Anderson & Corroon LLP, Declaration of Norbert Stahl in Support of Mergen Limited's Reply Brief in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity of Claim 1 of United States Patent NO. 6,054,270 Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 112, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-58, August 2004, Wilmington, Delaware.

EXAMINER	DATE CONSIDERED 3 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 20, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin Southern	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	NO

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

	112	Blank Rome LLP, Oxford Gene Technology's Claim Construction Brief In Response to Mergen's Claim Construction Briefing, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-118, August 2004, Wilmington, Delaware.
	113	Order and Memorandum Opinion of the U.S. District Court on Claim Construction, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-20, September 2004, Wilmington, Delaware.
	114	Order and Memorandum Opinion of the U.S. District Court on Expert Reports, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-23, November 2004, Wilmington, Delaware.
	115	Order and Memorandum Opinion of the U.S. District Court on Summary Judgment, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-39, November 2004, Wilmington, Delaware.
	116	Potter Anderson & Corroon LLP, Mergen Limited's Motion for Reconsideration of the Court's Order Granting in Part Oxford Gene Technology Limited's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of Infringement, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-16, December 2004, Wilmington, Delaware.
	117	Blank Rome LLP, Oxford Gene Technology Limited's Opposition to Mergen Limited's Motion for Reconsideration, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-28, December 2004, Wilmington, Delaware.
	118	Potter Anderson & Corroon LLP, Mergen Limited's Reply in Support of its Motion for Reconsideration of the Court's Order, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-8, December 2004, Wilmington, Delaware.
	119	Blank Rome LLP, Letter to Judge Jordan re claim terms, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-2, January 2005, Wilmington, Delaware.

EXAMINER	DATE CONSIDERED
John S. Brusca	5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

Sheet 16 of 17

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 20, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin Southern	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

no publisher	120	Order of the U.S. District Court on Mergen's Motion for Reconsideration, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-5, January 2005, Wilmington, Delaware.
JBB	121	Khrapko, K. et al., "An oligonucleotide hybridization approach to DNA sequencing", FEBS, Vol. 256, Nos. 1-2, pp. 118-122, October 1989.
no publisher	122	Potter Anderson & Corroon LLP, Telechem International, Inc.'s Responses to Oxford Gene Technology Ltd's First Set of Interrogatories, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Telechem International et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 04-013, pp. 1-22, October 2004, Wilmington, Delaware.
JBB	123	Polsky-Cynkin, R. et al., "Use of DNA Immobilized on Plastic and Agarose Supports to Detect DNA by Sandwich Hybridization", Clinical Chemistry, Vol. 31, No. 9, pp. 1438-1443, 1985.
	124	Michael Best & Friedrich LLP, Oxford Gene Technology Limited's Opening Markman Brief, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Motorola, Inc., U.S. District Court for the Northeastern District of Illinois, CA No. 02-9344, pp. 1-81, December 2003, Chicago, Illinois.
no publisher	125	Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione, Motorola's Response Markman Brief, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Motorola, Inc., U.S. District Court for the Northeastern District of Illinois, CA No. 02-9344, pp. 1-39, January 2004, Chicago, Illinois.
no publisher	126	Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione, Motorola's Response Markman Brief, Exhibits A-Z, the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Motorola, Inc., U.S. District Court for the Northeastern District of Illinois, CA No. 02-9344, pp. 1-195, January 2004, Chicago, Illinois.
	127	Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione, Motorola's Response Markman Brief, Exhibits A(1)-G(1), the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Motorola, Inc., U.S. District Court for the Northeastern District of Illinois, CA No. 02-9344, pp. 1-51, January 2004, Chicago, Illinois.
	128	Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione, Motorola's Response Markman Brief, Exhibits 1-3, the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Motorola, Inc., U.S. District Court for the Northeastern District of Illinois, CA No. 02-9344, pp. 1-23, January 2004, Chicago, Illinois.

EXAMINER	DATE CONSIDERED
J. Bruce	5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

Sheet 17 of 17

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 20, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin Southern	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

MAILED DEC 20 2005 PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

CANCELLED

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

	129	Michael Best & Friedrich LLP, OGT's Reply to Markman Brief, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Motorola, Inc., U.S. District Court for the Northeastern District of Illinois, CA No. 02-9344, pp. 1-21, March 2004, Chicago, Illinois.
	130	Michael Best & Friedrich LLP, OGT's Exhibit A Claim Chart, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Motorola, Inc., U.S. District Court for the Northeastern District of Illinois, CA No. 02-9344, pp. 1-10, March 2004, Chicago, Illinois.
	131	Michael Best & Friedrich LLP, OGT's Exhibit 1-9, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Motorola, Inc., U.S. District Court for the Northeastern District of Illinois, CA No. 02-9344, pp. 1-139, March 2004, Chicago, Illinois.
	132	Michael Best & Friedrich LLP, OGT's Exhibit H-R, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Motorola, Inc., U.S. District Court for the Northeastern District of Illinois, CA No. 02-9344, pp. 1-222, March 2004, Chicago, Illinois.
	133	Civil Docket for CA No. 99-0348, Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, Inc., U.S. District Court for Delaware, pp. 1-36, April 2005, Wilmington, Delaware.
	134	Civil Docket for CA No. 02-1695, Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen, Ltd., U.S. District Court for Delaware, pp. 1-31, April 2005, Wilmington, Delaware.
	135	Civil Docket for CA No. 04-0013, Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Telechem International, Inc., U.S. District Court for Delaware, pp. 1-7, April 2005, Wilmington, Delaware.
	136	Civil Docket for CA No. 02-1687, Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Nanogen, Inc., U.S. District Court for Delaware, pp. 1-5, April 2005, Wilmington, Delaware.
	137	Civil Docket for CA No. 02-9344, Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Motorola, Inc., U.S. District Court for the Northeastern District of Illinois, pp. 1-4, April 2005, Chicago, Illinois.

no publication date

EXAMINER	DATE CONSIDERED
M. Bruscia	5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

Sheet 1 of 13

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO-1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 8, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804

APPLICANT: Edwin SOUTHERN

FILING DATE	GROUP
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
JB	AA	4,216,245	8/1980	Johnson	427	2	
JB	AB	4,395,486	7/1983	Wilson et al.	435	6	
JB	AC	4,563,419	1/1986	Ranki et al.	435	6	

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO
JB	AD	0 235 726	9/1987	EP				
JB	AE	0 171 150	2/1986	EP				
JB	AF	85/01051	3/1985	WO				
JB	AG	0 268 237	5/1988	EP				
	AH							

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

	AI	Declaration from Radomir Crkvenjakov (with four exhibits), September 1996.
	AJ	Declaration from Ivan Labat , September 1996.
	AK	Statement from the Institute of Molecular Genetics and Genetic Engineering (IMGGE) in Belgrade, September 1996.
not published	AL	Statement by Professor Roger Ekins (with an abstract of a lecture given by him on 4/11/88 at a symposium, and a post-published paper corresponding to said lecture), December 1996.
	AM	Statutory Declaration of Dr. Nicholas Vaughan Ashely (with Exhibit NVA1), May 1995.
	AN	Statutory Declaration of Dr. William Bains (with Exhibits WB1, WB2 and WB3), May 1995.

EXAMINER: J. Bansa — DATE CONSIDERED: 5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 8, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804

APPLICANT: Edwin SOUTHERN

FILING DATE	GROUP
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
JB	BA	4,704,353	11/1987	Humphries et al.	435	4	
JB	BB	4,327,073	4/1982	Huang	424	1	
JB	BC	4,728,502	3/1988	Hamill	422	116	
JB	BD	5,002,867	3/1991	Macevicz	435	6	

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO
JB	BE	88/01302	2/1988	WO				
JB	BF	86/03782	7/1986	WO				
JB	BG	0 238 332	9/1987	EP				
JB	BH	2 156 074	10/1985	GB				
JB	BI	0 237 362	9/1987	EP				

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

	BJ	Declaration of Professor Lubert Stryer, January 1997.
	BK	Statutory Declaration of Dr. William Bains, January 1997.
not published	BL	Statutory Declaration of Dr. Nicholas Vaughan Ashley, January 1997.
not published	BM	Declaration of Edwin Mellor Southern (with Exhibits EMS1 and EMS2), January 1998.
	BN	Declaration of Dr. Thomas Gingeras, January 1999.
	BO	Declaration of Professor Calvin Quate, January 1999.

EXAMINER: J.S. Brusca — DATE CONSIDERED: 5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 8, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin SOUTHERN	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
JB	CA	5,202,231	4/1993	Drmanac et al.	435	6	
JB	CB	5,474,796	12/1995	Brennan	427	2.13	
JB	CC	5,429,807	7/1995	Matson et al.	422	131	

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO
JB	CD	89/11548	11/1989	WO				
JB	CE	93/22480	11/1993	WO				
JB	CF	0 386 229	9/1990	EP				
JB	CG	0 281 927	9/1988	EP				
JB	CH	0 130 739	1/1985	EP				

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

	CI	Declaration of Dr. Glenn Mc Gall, January 1999.
no publication	CJ	Declaration of Edwin Mellor Southern, July 2001.
no publication	CK	Bird & Bird, "Claimant's Notice of Experiments", In the United Kingdom Litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case no. HC 1999 02517, pp. 1-12, July 31, 2000, London, United Kingdom.
	CL	Declaration of Marvin Stodolsky, October 1996.
JB	CM	M. S. Urdea et al., "A novel method for the rapid detection of specific nucleotide sequences in crude biological samples without blotting or radioactivity; application to the analysis of hepatitis B virus in human serum", Gene, Vol. 61, 1987, pp. 253-264.
JB	CN	C. G. Miyada et al., "Oligonucleotide Hybridization Techniques", Methods in Enzymology, Vol. 154, No. 6, 1987, pp. 94-107.

EXAMINER	J. L. Bruzza	DATE CONSIDERED	5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 8, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804

APPLICANT	
Edwin SOUTHERN	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
JSB	DA	4,591,570	5/1986	Chang	436	518	
	DB						
	DC						

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO
JSB	DD	0 228 075	7/1987	EP				
JSB	DE	84/03151	8/1984	WO				
JSB	DF	0 194 132	9/1986	EP				
JSB	DG	0 063 810	11/1982	EP				
JSB	DH	0 130 523	1/1985	EP				

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

JSB	DI	E. Calva et al., "Analysis of the in vitro Synthesis of 5'-γ-^{32} P-labeled Transcripts from Coliphage λ by Gel Electrophoresis, RNA-DNA Hybridization, and RNase T1 Digestion", The Journal of Biological Chemistry, Vol. 255, No. 22, 1980, pp. 11011-11016.
JSB	DJ	A. R. Dunn et al., "A Novel Method to Map Transcripts: Evidence for Homology between an Adenovirus mRNA and Discrete Multiple Regions of the Viral Genome", Cell, Vol. 12, September 1977, pp. 23-36.
JSB	DK	G. Wengler et al.,"A Study of Nucleotide Sequence Homology Between the Nucleic Acids of Different Alphaviruses", Virology, Vol. 78, No. 1, 1977, pp. 124-134.
JSB	DL	J. M. Coffin et al., "Structure of the Genome of Moloney Murine Leukemia Virus: A Terminally Redundant Sequence" Cell, Vol. 13, No. 4, April 1978, pp. 761-773.
JSB	DM	A. Palva et al., "Laboratory Methods, Quantification of α-Amylase mRNA in *Bacillus subtilis* by Nucleic Acid Sandwich with Hybridization", DNA, Vol. 7, No. 2, 1988, pp. 135-142.
JSB	DN	R. Drmanac et al., "Sequencing of Megabase Plus DNA by Hybridization: Theory of the Method", abstract presented at Cold Spring Harbor Symposium on Gene Mapping and Sequencing, April 27-May 1, 1988, Cold Spring Harbor, NY.

EXAMINER	J. S. Brusca	DATE CONSIDERED	5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 8, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin SOUTHERN	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
	EA						
	EB						

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO
JSB	EC	0 142 299	5/1985	EP				
JSB	ED	86/06487	11/1986	WO				
JSB	EE	84/03564	9/1984	WO				
JSB	EF	86/00991	2/1986	WO				
JSB	EG	92/10092	6/1992	WO				

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

JSB	EH	R. Drmanac et al., "Sequencing by Hybridization , Theory of the Method", poster presented at Cold Spring Harbor Symposium on Gene Mapping and Sequencing, April 27-May 1, 1988, Cold Spring Harbor, NY.
no publisher	EI	I. Labat, "Subfragments as an informative characteristic of the DNA molecule - computer simulation", Search Report, Labat Thesis, (and English translation), 1988.
JSB	EJ	R. Frank et al., "Simultaneous Synthesis and Biological Applications of DNA Fragments: An Efficient and Complete Methodology", Methods in Enzymology, Vol. 154, No. 13, 1987, pp. 221-251.
JSB	EK	R. Frank et al., "A new general approach for the simultaneous chemical synthesis of large number of oligonucleotides: segmental solid supports", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 11, No. 13, 1983, pp. 4365-4377.
JSB	EL	A. R. Brautigam et al., "Rapid Typing of Herpes Simplex Virus Isolates by Deoxyribonucleic Acid: Deoxyribonucleic Acid Hybridization", Journal of Clinical Microbiology, Vol. 12, No. 2, August 1980, pp. 226-234.
JSB	EM	R. K. Saiki et al., "Analysis of Enzymatically Amplified β-globin and HLA-DQα DNA with Allele-Specific Oligonucleotide Probes", Nature, Vol. 324, November 1986, pp. 163-166.

EXAMINER J. S. Brusca — DATE CONSIDERED 5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: *Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.*

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 8, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin SOUTHERN	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
	FA						
	FB						

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO
JSB	FC	0 305 929	3/1989	EP				
JSB	FD	0 304 202	2/1989	EP				
	FE							
	FF							
	FG							

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

JSB	FH	A. Rosenthal et al., "Solid-phase methods for sequencing of nucleic acids I. Simultaneous sequencing of different eligodeoxyribonucleotides using a new, mechanically stable anion-exchange paper", Nucleic Acid Research, Vol. 13, No. 4, November 4,1985, pp. 1173-1184.
JSB	FI	B. Lewin, Ed., "Genes", Third Edition, 1987, pp. 360-362, John Wiley & Sons, NY, NY.
JSB	FJ	R. B. Wallace et al., "Hybridization of Synthetic Oligodeoxyribonucleotides to O_X174 DNA: The Effect of Single Base Pair Mismatch", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 6, No. 11, 1979, pp. 3543-3557.
JSB	FK	G. Beltz et al., "Isolation of Multigene Families and Determination of Homologies by Filter Hybridization Methods", Methods in Enzymology, Vol. 100, No. 19, 1983, pp. 266-285.
JSB	FL	Doklady Biochemistry, Proceedings of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Biochemistry Section, Russian Original, Vol. 303, No. 1-6, November-December 1988, pp. 355-452 and Translation from Russian, Consultants Bureau, New York, Plenum Publishing Corporation, 1989, pp. 436-438.
JSB	FM	F. C. Kafatos et al., "Determination of Nucleic Acid Sequence Homologies and Relative Concentrations by a dot Hybridization Procedure", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 7, No. 6, 1979, pp. 1541-1552.

EXAMINER	J. S. Brusca	DATE CONSIDERED	5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 8, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin SOUTHERN	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
	GA						
	GB						
	GC						

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO
	GD							
	GE							
	GF							
	GG							
	GH							

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

JSB	GI	R. J. Lipshutz et al., "Using Oligonucleotide Probe Arrays to Access Genetic Diversity", BioTechniques, Vol. 19, No. 3, 1995, pp. 442-447.
JSB	GJ	T. R. Gingeras et al., "Hybridization Properties of Immobilized Nucleic Acid", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 15, No. 13, 1987, pp. 5373-5390.
JSB	GK	P.T. Gilham, "The Synthesis of Polynucleotide-Celluloses and Their use in the Fractionation of Polynucleotides", J. Am. Chem. Soc., Vol. 86, November 20, 1964, pp. 4982-4985.
JSB	GL	H. M. Geysen et al., "Strategies for Epitope Analysis using Peptide Synthesis", Journal of Immunological Methods, Vol. 102, 1987, pp. 259-274.
JSB	GM	G. M. Church et al., "Genomic Sequencing", Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., Vol. 81(7), April 1984, pp. 1991-1995.
JSB	GN	V. J. Kidd et al., "α_1-Antitrypsin Deficiency Detection by Direct Analysis of the Mutation in the Gene", Nature, Vol. 304, July 1983, pp. 230-234.

EXAMINER J. E. Bruce — DATE CONSIDERED 5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: *Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.*

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 8, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin SOUTHERN	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
	HA						
	HB						
	HC						
	HD						

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO
	HE							
	HF							

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

HG	P. Masinkowski et al.,"Cloning f cDNA Sequences of Hormone-regulated Gene from the MCF-7 Human Breast Cancer Cell Line", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 10, No. 24, 1982, pp. 7895-7903.
HH	G. K. Sim et al., "Use of a cDNA Library for Studies on Evolution and Development Expression of the Chorion Multigene Families", Cell, Vol. 18, No. 4, December 1979, pp. 1303-1316.
HI	Margaret L. M. Anderson et al., "Quantitative Filter Hybridisation", Nucleic Action Hybridisation, A Practical Approach, 1985, pp. 73-111, IRL Press, Washington, D.C.
HJ	W. Bains et al., "A Novel Method for Nucleic Acid Sequence Determination", J. Theor. Biol., Vol. 135, 1988, pp. 303-307.
HK	U. B. Voss et al., "The Immobilization of Oligonucleotides and Their Hybridization Properties", Biochemical Society Transactions, Vol. 16, 1988, pp. 216-217.
HL	Ghosh et al., "Covalent Attachment of oligonucleotides to Solid Supports", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 15, No. 13, 1987, pp. 5353-5372.
HM	Arnold, et al. Federation Proceedings, Vol. 43, No. 7, May 4, 1984, Abstract 3669. "A novel universal support for DNA and RNA Synthesis"
HN	T. Maniatis et al., "Molecular Cloning", A Laboratory Manual, Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, 1982, p. 282, Cold Spring Harbor, NY.

EXAMINER: Jill Bruce — DATE CONSIDERED: 5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 8, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804

APPLICANT: Edwin SOUTHERN

FILING DATE	GROUP
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
	IA						

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO
	IB							

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

JB	IC	C. R. Cantor et al., "Report on the Sequencing by Hybridization Workshop", Genomics, Vol. 13, 1992, pp. 1378-1383.
JB	ID	T. L. Bugawan et al., "Rapid HLA-DLB Typing Using Enzymatically Amplified DNA and Nonradioactive Sequencing-Specific Oligonucleotide Probes", Immunogenetics, Vol. 32, 1990, pp. 231-241.
no author no publisher	IE	Global Technology Group, Flier for PA Consulting Group, 1988.
JB	IF	Stephen P. A. Fodor et al., "Light-Directed, Spatially Addressable Parallel Chemical Synthesis", Science, Vol. 251, February 15, 1991, pp. 767-773.
JB	IG	U. Maskos et al., "A Study of Oligonucleotide Reassociation using Large Arrays of Oligonucleotides Synthesised on a Glass Support", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 21, No. 20, 1992, pp. 4663-4669.
JB	IH	U. Maskos et al., "Parallel Analysis of Oligodeoxyribonucleotide (Oligonucleotide) Interactions. I. Analysis of Factors Influencing Oligonucleotide Duplex Formation", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 20, No. 7, 1992, pp. 1675-1678.
JB	II	J. C. Williams et al., "Studies of Oligonucleotide Interactions by Hybridisation to Arrays: The Influence of Dangling Ends on Duplex Yield", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 22, No. 8, 1994, pp. 1365-1367.
JB	IJ	E. M. Southern et al., "Arrays of Complementary Oligonucleotides for Analysing the Hybridisation Behaviour of Nucleic Acids, Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 22, No. 8, 1994, pp.1368-1373.
JB	IK	M. S. Shchepinov et al.,"Steric Factors Influencing Hybridisation of Nucleic Acids to Oligonucleotide Arrays", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 25, No. 6, 1997, pp. 1155-1161.
JB	IL	S. C Case-Green et al.,"Studies on the Base Pairing Properties of Deoxyinosine by Solid Phase Hybridisation to Oligonucleotides", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 22, No. 2, 1994, pp. 131-136.

EXAMINER	DATE CONSIDERED
J. L. Bruce	5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 8, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804

APPLICANT: Edwin SOUTHERN

FILING DATE	GROUP
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
	JA						

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO
	JB							

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

JC	U. Maskos et al., "A Novel Method for the Parallel Analysis of Multiple Mutations in Multiple Samples", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 21, No. 9, 1993, 2269-2270.
JD	M. J. Kozal et al., "Extensive Polymorphisms Observed in HIV-1 Clade B Protease Gene Using High-Density Oligonucleotide Arrays", Nature Medicine, Vol. 2, No. 7, July 1996, pp. 753-759.
JE	M. Chee et al., "Accessing Genetic Information with High-Density DNA Arrays", Science, Vol. 274, October 1996, pp. 610-614.
JF	Kirk -Othmer, Encyclopedia of Chemical Technology, Third Edition, Vol. 3, pp. 487-491, 1978.
JG	Kirk-Othmer, Encyclopedia of Chemical Technology, Third Edition, Vol. 15, p. 224, 1981.
JH	R. Polsky-Cynkin et al.,"Use of DNA Immobilized on Plastic and Agarose Supports to Detect DNA by Sandwich Hybridization, Clinical Chemistry, Vol. 31, No. 9, 1985, pp. 1438-1443.
JI	J. Welsh et al.,"Protein-DNA Cross-Linking" TIBS, Vol. 9, December 1984, pp. 505-508.
JJ	G. H. Parsons, Jr., "Antibody-Coated Plastic Tubes in Radioimmunoassay", Meth., Enzymol., Vol. 73, 1973, pp. 224-238.
JK	Southern et al., Genomics, "Analyzing and Comprising Nucleic Acid Sequences by Hybridization to Arrays of Oligonucleotides", Vol.13, 1992, pp. 1008-1017.
JL	

EXAMINER: John S. Brusca — DATE CONSIDERED: 5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

Sheet 11 of 13

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 8, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin SOUTHERN	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
	KA	5,486,452	1/1996	Gordon et al.	435	5	
	KB	4,994,373	2/1991	Stavrianopoulos et al.	435	6	
	KC	4,968,602	11/1990	Dattagupta	435	6	
	KD	4,961,915	10/1990	Martin	422	116	
	KE	4,849,330	7/1989	Humphries et al.	435	4	
	KF	4,451,433	5/1984	Yamashita et al.	422	63	
	KG	5,202,231	4/1993	Drmanac	435	6	
	KH	4,299,916	11/1981	Litman et al.	435	6	

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO
	KI	84/01031	3/1984	WO				

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

	KJ	Webster's Third New International Dictionary, G & C Merriam Company, Publishers, Springfield, Massachusetts, USA, 1966, pages with the definitions of the terms "solid" and "sheet".
	KK	The American Heritage Dictionary, Second College Edition, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, Massachusetts, 1991, page with the definition of the term "smooth".
	KL	The Dictionary of Ceramic Science and Engineering, Plenum Press, New York, NY, 1984 - definition of "smooth glass".
	KM	Academic Press Dictionary of Science and Technology, San Diego, CA , 1992 - definition of "smooth".
	KN	S. F. Wolf et al., "Rapid Hybridization Kinetics of DNA Attached to Submicron Latex Particles", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 15, No. 7, 1987, pp. 2911-2926.
	KO	J. N. Kremsky et al., "Immobilization of DNA via Oligonucleotides Containing an Aldehyde or Carboxylic Acid Group at the 5' Terminus", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 15, No. 7, 1987, pp. 2891-2909.

EXAMINER J. L. Bruce

DATE CONSIDERED 5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

Sheet 12 of 13

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 8, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin SOUTHERN	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
	LA						
	LB						
	LC						

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	TRANSLATION NO
	LD							
	LE							
	LF							
	LG							
	LH							

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

	LI	Letter to Simon Kiddle from Dr. Renzo Malvano, November 2002.
	LJ	Letter to Simon Kiddle from Dr. Gian Carlo Zucchelli, November 2002.
NO Publisher	LK	Declaration of Professor Alberto Albertini, November 2002.
	LL	Declaration of Dr. Gianni Messeri, November 2002.
	LM	Second Statement of Professor Roger Ekins, January 2003.

EXAMINER		DATE CONSIDERED	5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

Sheet 13 of 13

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

FORM PTO 1449 (*modified*)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)
(*Use several sheets if necessary*)

Date Submitted to PTO: December 8, 2005

ATTY DOCKET NO.	SERIAL NO.
99_1174	09/422,804
APPLICANT	
Edwin SOUTHERN	
FILING DATE	**GROUP**
October 22, 1999	1631

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
	MA						
	MB						

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES	NO
	MC							
	MD							

OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (*Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.*)

no publisher	ME	Slides used in Professor Ekins' lecture at the International Biotech RIA '88 Conference in Florence on 11th April 1988.
JSB	MF	Lev. D. Gelb and K.E. Gubbins, "Characterization of Porous Glasses by Adsorption: Models, Simulations and Data Inversion", Fundamentals of Adsorption, Vol. 6, 1999, pp. 551-556.
JSB	MG	Pharmacia Catalogue 1998, page describing Hybond-NX.
no publisher	MH	Translation of EP A 0197266 filed for UK national validation, 1991.
no publisher	MI	E. M. Southern, Award Molecular Bioanalytics 2004, Biography.
no publisher	MJ	Award Molecular Bioanalytics 2004.
JSB	MK	Bio Array News, Vol. 1, No. 1, June 1, 2001, pp. 1-10.
JSB	ML	News Events, Journal of Biomolecular Techniques, Vol. 15, 2004, pp. 152-153.

EXAMINER	J. S. Bruser	DATE CONSIDERED	5 February 2006

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

Notice of References Cited	Application/Control No. 09/422,804	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination SOUTHERN, EDWIN	
	Examiner John S. Brusca	Art Unit 1631	Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
*	A	US-3,356,462	12-1967	COOKE NELSON M; et. al.	422/102
	B	US-			
	C	US-			
	D	US-			
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	Caulfield et al. A Computer Program for the Evaluation of ELISA Data Obtained Using an Automated Microtiter Plate Absorbance Reader. J. Immunol. Methods Vol. 74, pages 205-215 (1984)
	V	Suggs et al. Use of synthetic oligonucleotides as hybridization probes: Isolation of cloned cDNA sequences for human beta2-microglobulin. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA Vol. 78, pages 6613-6617 (1981)
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.